

Application No.: 10/731,371  
Reply to Office Action dated: August 28, 2007  
Reply dated: November 28, 2007

### **Remarks**

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed August 28, 2007. No additional fee is due with this communication.

#### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed August 28, 2007, Claims 1-49 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 7-15, 20-27, 32-39, 44-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033535.

#### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment**

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 8, 13, 15, 20, 21, 24, 26, 33, 38, 45, and 48 , leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-49. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action mailed August 28, 2007, Claim 1-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033535. Accordingly, Claims 1, 13, 26 and 38 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim as amended now conforms to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 103(a), and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is amended to define "*a first server that includes an LDAP authentication server, wherein the first server holds information of group and access control list.*" Furthermore, claim 1 is also amended to comprise "*a single security data repository that resides in the second server and provides to the second server user security information associated with both the first server and the second server.*"

In the cited prior arts, Fisher discloses a common authentication protocol or proxy (CAP) server which includes an authentication interface that communicates with directory service

authentication backends. (Paragraph [0019]). Specially, in Paragraph [0023], Fisher emphasizes that the CAP server obtains the user or user group information from an external source.

Unlike Fisher, the first server in the embodiment of Claim 1 holds the information of group and access control list, while the second server includes an embedded LDAP server and connects to a single data repository for user security information associated with both the first server and the second server. (Paragraph [0027]). Because Fisher does not teach a CAP server, interpreted in the office action as the first server, that holds the information of group and access control list, while the backends, interpreted in the office action as the second server, connect to a single data repository and provides user security information associated with both the first server and the second server, Fisher cannot anticipate the embodiment of Claim 1 in the present invention. In addition, since Fisher emphasizes that the CAP server obtains the user or user group information from an external source, It would not be obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to model or use Fisher to hold user or user group information on the CAP server (or the first server) while maintaining other user security information in a single data repository, based on Fisher.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Fisher does not anticipate the embodiment of Claim 1 in the present invention or render the embodiment of Claim 1 in the present invention obvious. Therefore, independent 1 should be in allowable condition at least for the reason discussed above.

Furthermore, dependent claims 2-12 which are based on allowable independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition at least for the reasons discussed above.

In addition, independent claim 13, 26 and 38 are similarly amended as in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits independent claims 13, 26 and 38 should also be in allowable condition for the reasons discussed above.

Furthermore, dependent claims 14-25 which are based on allowable independent claim 13; dependent claims 27-37 which are based on allowable independent claim 26; and dependent claims 39-49 which are based on allowable independent claim 38 should all be in allowable condition at least for the reason discussed above.

Application No.: 10/731,371  
Reply to Office Action dated: August 28, 2007  
Reply dated: November 28, 2007

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Applicant believes that no fee is due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 28, 2007

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/

Kuiran (Ted) Liu  
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800